PROCEEDINGS
of
THE TRAVANCORE SRI MULAM ASSEMBLY.

(*OFFICIAL REPORT.*)

FIRST ASSEMBLY.

EIGHTH SESSION

Tuesday, the 28th July 1936/13th Karkatakam 1111.

The Assembly met again in the Victoria Jubilee Town Hall at Eleven of the clock, the President presiding.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Venkulam Railway Station.

11 * **MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB** (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) at what stage the Railway Station building at Idava (Venkulam) is ;

(*b*) when the estimate was prepared ; and

(*c*) whether the sanctioned amount was provided for in the budgets for 1110 and 1111 ?

MR. T. C. THOMMEN (*Secretary to Government*) : (*a*) Revised estimate for the Station was sanctioned last month (June).

(*b*) The revised estimate was received from the South Indian Railway by Government in May 1936.

(*c*) Provision was made in the budget for 1111.

Disbursement of Government money from treasuries.

12 * **MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI** (*Tiruvalla III*): Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) whether they are aware that the Retired Peishkar Mr. Vydialingom Pillai was ever given Rs. 10 in excess of his pension from the Government Treasury, Trivandrum ;

(*b*) whether they are aware that there were double payments of Rs. 150, as gratuity to a peon, from the Padmanabhapuram Treasury and the Account Office ; and

(*c*) if the answers to parts (*a*) and (*b*) are in the affirmative, th e action taken by the Government in the matter ?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : (*a*) Yes, not from the treasury but from the Payment Branch of the Account Office in Makaram 1110.

(*b*) Yes, not in the Account Office but only at the Vilavankod

G. P. T. 119. 305. 24-12-1111.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar].

Treasury to the extent of Rs. 143-14-4 in Dhanu 1110.

(*c*) In the case of (*a*), the amount was received back from the pensioner; and the subordinates responsible for the excess payment were punished departmentally. In the case of (*b*), the amount overpaid was recovered from the officers and subordinates responsible therefor.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): With reference to part (*a*) of answer to part (*c*) of the question, may I know from the Government the nature of the punishment given to them?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, the clerk was fined.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): May I know the amount of fine?

PRESIDENT: You want to know what the amount is. Well, is that going to matter much; it may be one anna or two annas.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): I want to know whether it is adequate or not. Is the Financial Secretary in a position to say before the House the amount of fine?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): No, Sir.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): May I know whether both the payments referred to in parts (*b*) and (*c*) were made from the same treasury?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): One payment was made from the Pre-audit branch of the Account Office and another from the Vilavancode Treasury.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): My question was whether Government are aware that there were double payments of Rs. 150 as gratuity to a Peon from the Padmanabhapuram treasury and the Account Office and the answer given is "Yes, not in the Account Office but from the Vilavancod Treasury". May I know what is meant by this?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): One payment was made from the Account Office

PRESIDENT: The honourable member must address the Chair.

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) One payment was made from the Pre-audit branch of the Account Office and another payment was made from the mofussil treasury. These are the facts.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): May I know why the officers and subordinates responsible were not punished, as in the case of those responsible for payment under part (*a*), in respect of part (*b*)?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): They were punished, Sir. There was a double payment and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the excess sum paid was recovered from the officers responsible both in the Account Office and in the Treasury. Recovery of the amount is a punishment by itself.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*) : But the answer to part (*c*) says that, in the case of part (*a*), the amount was received back from the pensioner and the subordinates responsible for excess payment were punished. In the case of part (*b*), the amount over-paid was recovered from the officers and the subordinates responsible therefor. May I know whether it is punishment ?

PRESIDENT : The member tells you that he regards recovery of the money from the subordinates concerned as a punishment.
Next question.

Provision for leave allowances in the Budget.

13 ❋ **MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI** (*Tiruvalla III*) : Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) whether they are aware that the Financial Secretary had replied, in the Public Accounts Committee meeting held on the 4th June 1935, that he was agreeable to make provision for leave allowances in the budget in future ;

(*b*) whether any such provision was made in the budget for 1111 ; and

(*c*) if the answer to part (*b*) is in the affirmative, the amounts for and departments to which such provision was made ?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) :

(*a*) Yes. The quesion has been examined as directed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Public Accounts Committee that met on the 17th and 19th June 1936 was also consulted. The Committee is of the opinion that the present system may continue, since, under the proposed arrangement, the provision made for leave allowances is likely to be diverted to other items within the grant, under the rules, that the present system is more economical and that the system in British India of including provision for leave reserve in the cadre itself is more costly. Government agree with the opinion of the Committee that the present system may continue.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The question does not arise in view of the answer to part (*b*).

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*) : May I know the reasons which weighed with the Financial Secretary to admit that he was agreeable to make provision for leave allowances in the Budget ?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : If it is possible, it is desirable, to make provision. But later on during the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly